

implement the provisions of the 1992 peace accords;

Whereas these elections demonstrate the strength and diversity of El Salvador's democratic expression and promote confidence that all political parties can work cooperatively at every level of government; and

Whereas these open, fair, and democratic elections of the new President and Vice President should be broadly commended: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the Government and the people of the Republic of El Salvador for the successful completion of democratic multiparty elections held on March 7, 1999, for President and Vice President;

(2) congratulates President-elect Francisco Guillermo Flores Perez and Vice President-elect Carlos Quintanilla Schmidt on their recent victory and their continued strong commitment to democracy, national reconciliation, and reconstruction;

(3) congratulates El Salvadoran President Armando Calderón Sol for his personal commitment to democracy, which has helped in the building of national unity in the Republic of El Salvador;

(4) commends all Salvadoran citizens and political parties for their efforts to work together to take risks for democracy and to willfully pursue national reconciliation in order to cement a lasting peace and to strengthen democratic traditions in El Salvador;

(5) supports Salvadoran attempts to continue their cooperation in order to ensure democracy, national reconciliation, and economic prosperity; and

(6) reaffirms that the United States is unequivocally committed to encouraging democracy and peaceful development throughout Central America.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MARCH 24, 1999

Mr. CRAIG. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, March 24. I further ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of the proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, and the time for the two leaders be reserved, and the Senate then begin consideration of S. Con. Res. 20, the budget resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. CRAIG. Madam President, tomorrow morning the Senate will begin consideration of the first concurrent budget resolution. Under the order, there will be 35 hours for consideration of the resolution. Any Senator intending to offer an amendment or amendments to the resolution should notify the managers to allow for an orderly process for the consideration of this measure. Rollcall votes can be expected throughout the day on Wednesday, and all Senators should anticipate busy sessions for the remainder of the week as we approach the Easter recess.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CRAIG. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I

now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order, following the remarks of the Senator from Louisiana, Senator LANDRIEU.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SPECTER. Reserving the right to object, I ask that I be added to the list of speakers for the evening.

Mr. CRAIG. I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Pennsylvania be allowed to follow the Senator from Louisiana, and that following his remarks the Senate stand in adjournment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

(The remarks of Ms. LANDRIEU pertaining to the introduction of S. 682 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

KOSOVO

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have remained after the conclusion of the vote to comment about the vote and about a very significant historical precedent which was established tonight. The Senate of the United States took up its constitutional responsibility to make a decision as to whether Congressional authority would be given for the United States to commit an act of war in Kosovo following a request by the President of the United States for such a vote.

In modern times, we have seen the erosion of the congressional authority to declare war. Tonight in the Senate, we reaffirmed the basic constitutional responsibility and authority of the Congress on that very subject, after the President had made a significant request for authorization to use force.

This action tonight follows the situation in January of 1991 when the Congress of the United States authorized the use of force in the Persian Gulf following a similar request by President Bush. I believe that this is of great importance historically as a precedent, to guide the future Presidents, that their authority as Commander in Chief does not extend to involving the United States in war. Where acts of war are involved, it is a matter for the Congress of the United States and not the unilateral action of the President of the United States.

On the merits of this evening's vote, it was a very difficult vote. It was the choice of two very undesirable alternatives. In voting aye and supporting the use of force, I chose what I considered to be the lesser of the undesirable alternatives.

The President in his letter today said that the United States national interests are clear and significant. I disagree with that conclusion by the President.

The President then went on in his letter to amplify those national inter-

ests. Yet the absence of a very strong purpose and reason underscores my conclusion that this is an extremely difficult question on U.S. national interests. The President's letter continues, the first line of the second paragraph says, "The United States national interests are clear and significant." The second line says, "The ongoing effort by President Milosevic to attack and repress the people of Kosovo could ignite a wider European war with dangerous consequences to the United States. This is a conflict with no natural boundaries. If it continues it will push refugees across borders and draw into neighboring countries."

That is a statement of possibility, but we know that this is intervention by NATO, including the United States, in what is essentially a civil war. The President then went on in the second paragraph to say, "NATO has authorized airstrikes against the former Yugoslavia to prevent a humanitarian catastrophe and to address the threat to peace and security of the Balkan region and Europe."

The President relies quite substantially upon the "humanitarian catastrophe", he may really be saying the use of force for humanitarian purposes, and it may be that this standard is a one which ought to be adopted. But I do suggest that this may be a departure from what has previously been recognized as U.S. policy to use force where there is a vital United States national security interest. If we look for humanitarian catastrophes, we can find them all around the world, and we have been criticized for not doing more at an earlier stage in Bosnia. We have been criticized for not doing more in Rwanda. There have been many criticisms leveled against the United States and the civilized world for not intervening on prior occasions. It may be that with such a thin statement of vital national interests, the authorization to use force in Kosovo really reflects a shifting standard. As the President articulates, "to prevent a human catastrophe."

(Mr. BROWNBACK assumed the Chair.)

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, several weeks ago, I filed a resolution for the use of airstrikes in Kosovo. This was essentially a vehicle to move the Senate of the United States to take up the issue of the use of force, to debate it and to decide the question. It has always been my view, as expressed in 1991 in the debate on the use of force in the Persian Gulf and, before that in 1983, where we debated the War Powers Act with respect to deployment of marines in Lebanon, that the constitutional issue of Congress' sole authority to declare war is of paramount importance.

I congratulate our leadership today for moving through a procedural morass, where we had a cloture vote—that is, a vote to cut off debate—on the resolution pending by the Senator from